

SECRET

BI-WEEKLY PROPAGANDA GUIDANCE

NUMBER 111

DATE: 11 March 1963

Central Propaganda Directive
Briefly Noted

Record Copy

- 632. "Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals"
- 633. Peking Takes the Offensive (People's Daily and Red Flag Statements)
- 634. New Threats From Marshal Malinovsky
- 635 NE, The Kurdish Minority in Iraq
- EE, g.
- 636 AF, FE, Brazil's Congress of Solidarity
- NE, WH. with Cuba

List of
25X1C Attachments (unclassified)

SECRET

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010005-5

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010005-5

DATES OF PROPAGANDA INTEREST

28-30 March Congress of Solidarity with Cuba, scheduled for Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

17 April Birthday of N.S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, First Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee (born 1894)

17 April National Organizations of Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AAPSO) to observe 17 April (Bay of Pigs) anniversary as Day of Solidarity of AAPSO with the peoples of Latin America

19 April World Federation of Resistance Fighters (FIR; Communist Front) Commemoration of 20th Anniversary of Warsaw Ghetto uprising

20 April 1889: Hitler's Birthday (possible anti-German moves by Communists)

24 April World Youth Day Against Colonialism and for Peaceful Coexistence (Communist)

April Afro-Asian Journalists' Conference, Indonesia (Djakarta-Bandung), 24-30 April 1963

28 April Italian general elections schedules

April Twentieth Anniversary of German's discovery of the Communist KATYN massacre (see 19 April)

1 May World Holiday of Labor (celebrated by Communists, Socialists, certain other Labor groups)

8 May VE Day, 1945

12 May 328 day Berlin land blockade ended as a result of successful US airlift, 1949

14 May Warsaw Pact, 20-year mutual defense treaty signed at Warsaw by USSR, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and East Germany, in 1955

30 May Communist coup d'etat in Hungary, 1947

10 June Twentieth anniversary of Moscow's official declaration disbanding the Communist International (COMINTERN).

12 March 1963

632. "Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals"

25X1C10b

BACKGROUND: The size of sovereign states is circumscribed by upper and lower limits, above or below which no state can be expected to survive long: they will either collapse because of internal weaknesses and tensions or be destroyed by external enemies. These upper and lower limits of viability have repeatedly changed throughout history, depending upon the development of military forces, economic resources, means of transport and communications, etc. The empires of Alexander the Great, Genghis Khan, Napoleon or Hitler could not last because they were too big and too unwieldy for their times. At the other end of the scale, the Greek city states could not survive Persian invasion, the divided feudal states of Spain had to unite before they could throw off Moorish rule and the small neighbors of Stalin, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, were unable to maintain their independence in World War Two.

Sovereignty in the Nuclear Age. The lessons of two World Wars, but particularly the beginning of the nuclear age, paralleled by the rapid development of world-wide mass communications, jet air travel, and vastly increased economic and cultural interrelations between all nations and all continents have radically raised these minimum and maximum sizes once more. Today, most states' sovereignty is still a legal-diplomatic assumption but no longer a political-military reality; even large, populous industrial countries must depend on friends and allies to maintain their independence (India's defense against Chinese aggression) and cannot act with true freedom in the international field (France's and Britain's withdrawal from Suez).

Recognition of this harsh, but fundamental fact of international relations in the nuclear age is being impeded and delayed by several factors:

- a. the sufferings of World War Two in most of Europe and a major part of Asia have provided intense new impulses for nationalist motivations, pride of national independence and hatred against foreign enemies;
- b. former colonial areas, upon reaching their independence, mostly developed fierce nationalist attitudes (and this involves at least one half of all mankind);
- c. the Communists, though dogmatically

formal national sovereignty (partly, in order to ward off "intervention" in what they claim to be their internal affairs--see their opposition against UN investigation of the Hungarian revolution; partly, in order to facilitate their "salami tactics" in expanding their empire--if Finland, for instance, were more closely allied with the rest of Scandinavia, or even with all of free Europe, Soviet pressure against this little country would be less effective).

International and Regional Groupings. Despite these formidable obstacles, considerable progress in world-wide and regional cooperation between governments and nations has been made since 1945. The UNITED NATIONS, with its auxiliary organizations (UNESCO, UNICEF, ILO, WHO, World Court, etc.), though still requiring much strengthening, has already proven far more effective than the old League of Nations. Cooperative enterprises for post-war reconstruction such as the Marshall Plan and the Colombo Plan, have been highly successful. The US has overcome its traditional aversion against "entangling alliances", has joined (military, but partly also political) regional defense organizations such as NATO, SEATO and OAS, and has participated in the military committee of CENTO. Even the Communist Bloc developed such regional organizations as the Warsaw Pact (military) and CEMA/COMECON (economic).

European Integration. The need for close supra-national cooperation was particularly keenly felt in Europe, twice in the 20th century the battlefield of devastating wars. In World War Two, most of continental Europe (except Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal and Turkey) was swallowed up in Hitler's "Fortress Europe"--which was also intended to stretch from the Atlantic, which it did reach, to the Urals, which it narrowly missed. After these experiences and confronted with the threat of an expanding Communist empire, advanced to the Elbe River in the heart of Germany, most Europeans recognized, with impressive speed and clarity, the need for close regional cooperation. A chain of organizations, always actively aided and encouraged by the US--beginning with OEEC ("Organization for European Economic Cooperation"--in support of the Marshall Plan, reorganized with broader interests as the OECD ("Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development") and now including EEC ("European Common Market") as well as NATO and several other regional bodies, have: overcome the ravages of the war in surprisingly short time; brought the member nations unprecedented prosperity; and sharply reduced the economic, political and cultural obstacles previously created by the intricate network of Europe's national boundaries.

New European Concepts? The idea that Europe is an entity of its own, should stand on its own feet and even assume the role of a "third-force," mediating or even arbitrating between

11 March 1963

the Soviet Union and the US, is by no means new. It has, however, gained new momentum and has developed from a somewhat abstract concept into a key issue of current European politics during the last few months because:

- a. Europe's prosperity makes her no longer dependent on US economic aid but, on the contrary, has turned her into a major competitor on the world markets;
- b. the nuclear stalemate developing between the US and the Soviet Union, especially the restraint imposed upon Moscow's expansion plans by the setback experienced in Cuba, seems to facilitate Europe's own defense;
- c. De Gaulle's termination of the war in Algeria and the popular mandate repeatedly conferred upon him by the French people has greatly strengthened his hand in building up a French national nuclear force and in striving for France's hegemony in the integration of Europe.

To the Urals? That Europe begins at the eastern shores of the North Atlantic is beyond dispute: but whether it extends to the Urals and whether this entire area can be considered a political, economic and cultural entity must be seriously doubted. Let us examine the main aspects of this proposition:

- a. The Urals as a geographic border. Only an arbitrary geographers' choice has made the Urals a conventional borderline between 2 continents. /Many doubt even whether Europe is really an independent continent./ Actually, this north-south chain of hills and medium-level mountains, often not above 2,000 feet and rarely reaching 5,000 feet does not separate two different types of lands: the same low plains extend both west and east from the Urals.
- b. The Urals as a political dividing line. Never in history did the Urals stop invasions or migrations, whether westward or eastward. Even though the Tsars' main foreign interests were directed towards Europe, they gradually occupied and colonized (however inadequately) the vast reaches of Siberia, at one time even extending into Alaska. Today, the Urals are not even an administrative boundary line within the USSR: the Russian Soviet Republic extends both east and west of the Urals. During and since World War Two, more and more Soviet industries have been shifted into Soviet Asia and the colonization

of these areas has made considerable progress. Soviet political and administrative doctrine and practice disregard any differentiation between "European" and "Asian" areas of the USSR.

Russia, Europe and "the Yellow Peril." Promoters of the "Europe to the Urals" concept claim that Communism is only a passing surface phenomenon, that the lasting interests of Russia will compel her to "return" to Europe, especially in order to join forces against the threat of Chinese expansion and aggression. Concerning this claim--promoted not only by de Gaulle's school, but also by some intellectuals in Germany and elsewhere--the following facts have to be considered:

- a. Historically, Russia has never been fully "European" in the same sense as France and Germany;
- b. The civilization of "European" Russia is quite different from that of Europe: her religion--and with it, much of her art--came from Byzantium; she was hardly at all touched by the great trends of European progress, such as Humanism, Renaissance or Reformation;
- c. European traditions of human dignity, of the rights of the individual, of freedom--from classic Greece to the Declaration of the Rights of Man--have never fully penetrated Russia which has been ruled by autocrats, from Ivan the Terrible to Stalin and Khrushchev;
- d. While Communist rule will come to an end like any other dictatorship, it is dangerously wishful thinking to call it a "surface phenomenon" or to count on its early disappearance;
- e. Even if the current frictions between Moscow and Peking may sharply deteriorate, both remain Communist and bitterly hostile to the free world,

25X1C10b



25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010005-5

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010005-5

633. Peking Takes the Offensive (People's Daily and
25X1C10b Red Flag Statements)

BACKGROUND: In two major pronouncements, one an editorial in People's Daily of 27 February and the other a lengthy article in the 4 March issue of the theoretical journal Red Flag, the Chinese Communists have mounted a bold ideological offensive promulgating their own fundamentalist brand of communism and challenging Moscow's leadership of the Communist movement.

The editorial in People's Daily entitled "Whence the Differences?--A Reply to Comrade Thorez and Other Comrades" details in uncompromising terms the Chinese version of the origin and development of the Sino-Soviet dispute and establishes Chinese criteria for a rapprochement. The Red Flag article, entitled "More on the Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us," running to approximately 60,000 words, sets the framework of the Sino-Soviet dispute in absolute terms as the third great debate in the history of the international Communist movement. Both articles use proxy targets as an intentionally transparent guise for what is in effect a direct attack on Khrushchev and his policies.

The latest stage in the Sino-Soviet dispute can be characterized as the increasingly aggressive attempts of both sides to out-maneuver the other, to line up support in the world Communist movement and to gain a decisive breakthrough. While the tactics employed in this contest vary and may result from time to time in a muting or exacerbation of public polemics, the stakes remain the same: direction of the Communist movement. During the satellite and Italian Party congresses which were held from October 1962 to January 1963, the Soviet side adopted more aggressive tactics accusing the Chinese by name, condemning both their theories and their methods and in general attempting to make it appear as if the Chinese were an isolated heretical minority challenging the entire Communist movement. At the East German Party Congress, the delegates went so far as to boo and hiss the speech of the Chinese representative while giving a rousing cheer for the Yugoslav delegate. Since then the Soviets, while continuing their criticisms, have steadfastly proclaimed

~~SECRET~~ (633. Continued)

their readiness to meet bi-laterally with the Chinese in preparation for a general meeting of all Parties. In this way they attempted to place the Chinese on the defensive and to shift to them the onus of splitting Communist unity. Meanwhile, it appeared that some more serious form of bi-lateral negotiations were being prepared. In early February, at a diplomatic reception, Khrushchev greeted the Chinese Ambassador with a hug and on 23 February Gromyko gave a luncheon for him. The same day the Soviet Ambassador in Peking was received by Mao, the first time in many years that Mao has received a Soviet representative. Both Parties publicized these meetings in an effort to stress that the intransigence was not on its side. Then, beginning 20 February, Peking began reprinting on a daily basis a series of major Soviet, Italian and French statements relating to the Sino-Soviet dispute. The reason Peking decided to make public these attacks on the Chinese Party becomes evident in the light of the two articles under discussion.

The first article, "Whence the Differences," is really a discussion of the un-Marxist-Leninist manner in which the CPSU has managed its relations with the other Communist Parties. The recurrent accusation is that the CPSU is guilty of "great-nation chauvinism," i.e. of putting the national interests of the Soviet Union ahead of the interests of the international Communist movement:

"Certain comrades place the resolutions of one party /obviously a reference to the 22nd CPSU Program/ above the Moscow Declaration which is the common program for international communism. No resolution of any party congress can be taken as the common line of the movement or as binding on other parties."

And in this connection, they also accuse the pro-Soviet Parties of unworthy servility to the CPSU:

"Twisting about in this way and following the baton so unconditionally cannot be regarded as indicative of normal relations of independence and equality."

The document also makes an issue of Yugoslav revisionism referring to it as a major question of principle:

"The question of the Tito clique is not one of interpreting the Moscow Declaration but whether or not to tear it up....it is a question not of helping comrades rectify mistakes but of unmasking and denouncing the enemies of Marxism-Leninism."

Regarding the 1960 Moscow Declaration the Chinese state:

"The Chinese Party will never allow the common agreement of the fraternal parties to be doctored or scrapped, will never allow traitors to be pulled into our ranks and will never agree to any trading in Marxist-Leninist principles."

Detailing their conditions for ceasing polemics and agreeing to another international meeting, the Chinese demand that the Soviets confess their error:

"...Do you or do you not consider the public attacks you have been making on fraternal parties were a mistake? Are you or are you not ready to admit this mistake and apologize to the parties you have attacked? Are you truly and sincerely ready to return to the proper course of interparty consultation on the basis of equality....not only must attacks on the Chinese Party cease, the attacks leveled at the Albanian Party and at other fraternal parties must also stop. However, it is absolutely impermissible to use the pretext of stopping polemics in order to forbid the exposure and condemnation of Yugoslav revisionists; this violates the provision of the Moscow Statement...."

The Red Flag article returns to the framework of the dispute as well as to the substantive points at issue. In so doing, it not only explicitly challenges the right of the CPSU to interpret Marxism-Leninism for the movement but, by implication, indicates that the Chinese comrades, as the true inheritors of Marx and Lenin, are in a far better position to fulfill this function. Thus, the Chinese see the debate in terms of the future direction of the international movement and as a struggle between the defenders of the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the entire working-class movement versus "the revisionist trend which is the product of the imperialists."

"In the last analysis one ideological trend is genuine...revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and the other is bourgeois ideology....that is anti-Marxist-Leninist ideology."

The article goes on to claim that the "modern revisionists" hope to abolish Marxism-Leninism at one stroke; liquidate the liberation struggles of the oppressed peoples; and save the imperialists and reactionaries from their doom.

"Marxist-Leninists have the duty to differentiate between right and wrong....The ideas of Togliatti and other comrades constitute a most serious challenge to the theory of Marxism-Leninism and an attempt to overthrow it completely....We will never allow a handful of people to keep on with their splitting activities."

Evidently seeking to demonstrate both the importance of the stakes and their goal of total victory, Peking characterizes differences with the CPSU as the third great debate in the Communist movement, emphasizing the result of the first two in which Kautsky and Bernstein in the one case and Trotsky in the other were all banished to eternal damnation by Lenin and Stalin respectively, the representatives of the one and only true Marxism.

Both documents repeat the Chinese views on the basis of the substantive issues at stake in the dispute; however on this occasion Peking treats its readers to a detailed Marxist-Leninist analysis of a number of basic questions. Those chosen for particular emphasis are the questions of defining the present epoch; the nature of contradictions; war and peace; means for seizing power; attitude towards the imperialists; and, above all, the question of how inter-party relations should be conducted. From 1959 on:

"The leaders of certain CP's went back on the joint agreement they had signed and endorsed; and made Tito-like statements; did their best to prettify US imperialists and turned....their struggle against the fraternal parties...."

The "revisionists" are accused of substituting a "bourgeois supra-class viewpoint" in place of the Marxist-Leninist view of class struggle; of robbing Marxism-Leninism of its revolutionary elan; of "substituting bourgeois pragmatism for dialectical materialism." Togliatti "and others" are said to be guilty of attempting to substitute class collaboration for class struggle, "structural reform" for proletarian revolution and "joint intervention" for the national liberation movement.

The Chinese documents emphasize the significance of the Chinese experience for the peoples' liberation struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America and the need to support these struggles. They characterize the condition of these peoples thusly:

"Fifty million people on earth are still groaning under colonial rule....although a number

of countries have won their independence in recent years, their economies are still under the control of foreign monopoly capitalism."

The articles also make a very interesting distinction between the metropolitan CP's of the imperialist countries, i.e. the "haves," vs. the "have nots" of the developing areas:

"The proletarian parties of the metropolitan imperialist countries are duty bound to heed the voice of the revolutionary peoples in these regions, study their experience, respect their revolutionary feelings, and support their revolutionary strugglesThey have no right whatsoever to flaunt their seniority before these people, to put on lordly airs, to carp and cavil....The present situation is an excellent one for the...oppressed nations and peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America to act..."

Finally, the Red Flag article also denounces the CPSU and its followers for concealing the Chinese views from other parties:

"The doughty warriors who claim to possess the totality of Marxist-Leninist truth are mortally afraid of the articles written in reply to their attacks by the so-called dogmatists, sectarians, splitters, nationalists, and Trotskyites whom they have so vigorously condemned. They dare not publish these articles in their own newspapers and journals. As cowardly as mice, they are frightened to death, they dare not let the people of their own countries read our articles, and they have tried to impose a watertight embargo. They are even using powerful stations to jam our broadcasts and prevent their people from listening to them. Dear friends and comrades, who claim to possess the whole truth! Since you are quite definite that our articles are wrong, why don't you publish all these erroneous articles and then refute them point by point so as to inculcate hatred among your people against the heresies you call dogmatism, sectarianism, and anti-Marxism-Leninism? Why do you lack the courage to do this, why such a stringent embargo? You fear the truth. The huge specter you call "dogmatism," that is, genuine Marxism-Leninism, is haunting the world, and it threatens you. You have no faith in the people, and the people have no faith in you. You are divorced from the masses. That is why you fear the truth, and carry your fear to such absurd lengths. Friends, comrades! If you are men enough,

~~SECRET~~

11 March 1963

step forward! Let each side in the debate publish all the articles in which it is criticized by the other side. And let the people in our own countries and the whole world think and judge who is right and who is wrong. That is what we are doing, and we hope you will follow our example."

The article concludes with a disingenuous expression of the willingness of the Chinese Party to discuss these issues with the fraternal and workers' parties of all countries; however it notes that the "success of such a meeting would depend on the prior overcoming of many difficulties and obstacles and on the doing of a great deal of preparatory work..."

Conclusions: The latest Chinese pronouncement amounts to considerably more than just a rebuttal of Khrushchev's brand of communism; it constitutes in effect an initiative vis-a-vis all the various Communist Parties of the world--and particularly the developing world--aimed at persuading them to transfer their allegiance to the true Marxist-Leninists, to a Party whose recent conquest of power has taken place in conditions similar to theirs, to a Communist Party which promises to actively and aggressively assist them to seize power. For, while the Khrushchev, Tito and Togliatti interpretation of Marxism-Leninism may correspond more closely to the reality in the advanced industrial societies of Europe, Mao's uncomplicated fundamentalism is certain to strike responsive cords in the hearts of many a zealous and frustrated Communist activist in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The terms advanced by the Chinese as the sine qua non for rapprochement amount to a demand for total capitulation by Moscow. In effect, Peking has cast the dispute in the following historic equation: Lenin plus Marxism-Leninism plus the Communist movement vs. the Kautsky/Bernstein revisionist; Stalin plus Marxism-Leninism plus the Communist movement vs. Trotsky; and now the Chinese Communists plus Marxism-Leninism plus the Communist movement vs. "a handful of people who keep on with their splitting activities" (i.e. Khrushchev and his followers). Such a framework is hardly conducive to reconciliation.

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010005-5

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010005-5

~~SECRET~~

11 March 1963

634. New Threats From Marshal Malinovsky

25X1C10b

BACKGROUND: In June 1957, Marshal Zhukov, then Soviet Minister of Defense, helped Khrushchev by using military transport to bring Khrushchev's Central Committee supporters to Moscow, thus enabling Khrushchev to defeat the "anti-party group." But perhaps because he feared Zhukov's power, perhaps because he resented Zhukov's efforts to reduce the amount of time spent on indoctrinating the forces, or perhaps because Zhukov favored a more cautious policy in the then-acute Syrian-Lebanese problem, Khrushchev sent Zhukov on a trip to Albania, and then removed him from office (October 1957). Marshal Rodion Yakovlevich Malinovsky promptly denounced Zhukov as a "fresh-baked Bonaparte", and soon thereafter was rewarded with Zhukov's old position.

Malinovsky is one of the few surviving specimens of a type of general once found in many armies, the hard-drinking, bushy-browed, glorified top sergeant. Weighing some 300 pounds, and with a nose which has been compared to a potato, he is now 65 years old, and has perceptibly aged in recent years; it has been reported that he is diabetic. In some ways, he is a military counterpart to N.S. Khrushchev himself. Like Khrushchev, Malinovsky was able to advance in rank largely due to Stalin's purges, and like most other senior generals in the Red Army, he held a command in the Stalingrad campaign. Later his Army Group captured Bucharest, Budapest, and Vienna, and after Hiroshima he conducted the "one week war" in Manchuria against the Japanese. His great virtue in World War II was that, like Marshal Joffre in World War I, nothing made him panic. In Malinovsky's frequent appearances on the speaking platform, he has the alarming aspect of an aging Mars, though somewhat gone to seed.

After becoming Minister, Malinovsky quietly accepted greater Party participation in military affairs, and Khrushchev's temporary cut in troop strength. But Khrushchev has regularly used Malinovsky's gruff exterior whenever a little saber-rattling seemed to be called for. On 14 January 1960, Malinovsky said that one Soviet rocket--and he implied that there were hundreds--could equal all the devastation caused by Anglo-American bombing in Europe in World War II. When Khrushchev went to Paris for the abortive summit meeting in May 1960, following the U-2 incident, Malinovsky accompanied Khrushchev everywhere, even into private meetings with de Gaulle and Macmillan. (Khrushchev, on the other hand,

(634 Cont.)

~~SECRET~~

11 March 1963

accompanied Malinovsky on a visit to Pleurs, S.E. of Paris, where Malinovsky had been billeted while serving with Russian forces in France during World War I.) It is now clear that the Soviet war lord was brought along for his intimidation value, and did not come (as some observers thought at the time) to watch Khrushchev on behalf of the military. Malinovsky declared on 30 May 1960 that Soviet rocket forces had been ordered to shoot down any intruding aircraft. During the height of the 1961 Berlin crisis, on 14 September 1961, Malinovsky's name appeared under an article in Pravda, hinting that world war, while not fatally inevitable, would be a logical outcome to the class struggle. At the 22nd CPSU Congress in October 1961, the Marshal claimed that "the problem of destroying rockets in flight has been successfully solved" by the USSR; he also predicted that in the event of general war, "whole countries will be turned into lifeless deserts covered with ashes." On 16 October 1962, at an army ideological conference, Malinovsky stated that the Soviet forces had recently taken a major step, which had "further increased the military superiority of the socialist camp over the aggressive bloc of imperialist countries"; his listeners probably thought he meant some kind of bomb or rocket, but in retrospect, it seems likely that he was referring to the Soviet buildup in Cuba. On 25 October, at the height of the Cuban crisis, this speech was reprinted in Red Star, the newspaper of the Soviet forces.

The outcome of the Cuban affair indicated that Soviet anti-missile missiles had not really become operational, and that Soviet forces did not have the crushing superiority claimed by Malinovsky. Significantly, he spoke much less ominously on 7 November, and his order of the day for 17 November even omitted all threats and stressed peaceful coexistence. But this mildness was not to last. With frictions arising in NATO, the Soviets began again to utter new threats, designed to intimidate the western nations, to reassure Castro, and perhaps to appease the Chinese Communists. At an Army Day meeting on 22 February, attended by Khrushchev in his Lieutenant General's uniform, Malinovsky warned that in case of war, the Soviets might use a 100 megaton "fireball" bomb on the United States. He asserted that the USSR had "several times" more missiles than the US, and added ominously: "We do not know of facts which would indicate a departure by the imperialist circles of the US from the policy of war." The circling of Soviet ships by American submarines might, he said, "prove extremely dangerous." (Naturally he said nothing of similar action by Soviet ships and planes; one such Soviet action was disclosed by Secretary McNamara on 28 February 1963.) Malinovsky climaxed his threats by saying, "we would like to warn the aggressive

(634 Cont.)

~~SECRET~~

11 March 1963

circles of the United States that an attack on the Cuban Republic would mean a third world war. The Soviet Union will be in the first ranks of those who will come to Cuba's assistance." Malinovsky's latest statements did not unduly concern American leaders; Secretary Rusk said the speech was "just what you'd expect on the 45th anniversary of the Soviet Armed Forces." But it discouraged those who had hoped that, after the Cuban crisis, international relations might be spared this kind of static.

While Malinovsky's statements are doubtless approved by Khrushchev, there have recently been signs of potential trouble between the two men. Marshal Yeremenko, a wartime commander in what has now been renamed the "battle of the Volga" (see Guidance #548, 30 July 1962), has claimed in a book and an article (Pravda, 27 January) that he and Khrushchev first conceived of counter-offensive strategy at Stalingrad, took the initiative in planning a counter-attack, and finally obtained the approval of a passive and unimaginative General Headquarters. Yeremenko heavily stresses the active role taken by Khrushchev and suggests that Khrushchev and he were close collaborators. Although Malinovsky was also on the Stalingrad front--and indeed probably owes his present position to his acquaintance with Khrushchev then--he also has an interest in asserting the leadership of the top command echelons. Malinovsky therefore replied to Yeremenko in a Pravda article of 2 February, sharply emphasizing the primary role of GHQ in conceiving and planning the counter-attack. Malinovsky (or his staff writer) suggests that Khrushchev's leadership in the battle was political, not military. Even more strikingly, Malinovsky praises Zhukov's role in the planning, mentioning him four times, three times as "Comrade." Zhukov has not received such favorable public mention since his downfall in 1957. While Malinovsky in no way praises Stalin or criticizes Khrushchev, his more accurate and less sycophantic description is unlikely to endear him to Khrushchev, and the favorable mention of Zhukov suggests that the question of priority between professional-military and ideological considerations is not yet finally resolved. In a contest, Khrushchev would almost certainly get his way. But as with biology, philosophy, and agriculture, the political distortion of professional military thought, including military history, hampers effective performance; in this case it also weakens discipline.

25X1C10b

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010005-5

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010005-5

~~SECRET~~

11 March 1963

635 NE, EE, g. The Kurdish Minority in Iraq
25X1C10b

BACKGROUND: The Kurdish people consist of largely nomadic or semi-nomadic tribes living in five countries: Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Syria (a few hundred thousand), and the USSR (less than one hundred thousand). They are known to have existed at least since 2,000 B.C. and some of the more ancient Kurdish tribes still exist--for example, the Baba (the Babans are one of the oldest tribes) in the new revolutionary government of Iraq. There are perhaps as many as 3 million in Turkey and possibly one and a half million each in Iraq and Iran; since there has never been an adequate census (the Turks, for instance, do not recognize that there is such a being as a Kurd; they call him a "mountain Turk") any figures given are most unreliable. Some of the Kurdish tribes, nevertheless, probably constitute the oldest still-extant aristocracy on earth. They have been fighting to attain independence (and some of the tribes occasionally have succeeded for a while) virtually throughout their long history--through the empires, for example, of the Sumerians, the Hittites, Assyrians, Medes, Persians, Armenians, Turcomans, Ottoman Turks, Iranians and Iraqis. In sum, there are about 5-10 million Kurds today; all of them, without exception, are part of a minority in the five countries where they reside; practically all of them still desire autonomy and independence, although some of them dare not publicly voice such a desire. In the twentieth century, they have even occasionally fought for it--e.g., in Turkey, Iran and Iraq.

In the years 1925, 1930 and 1933, Kurdish uprisings in Turkey were put down with brutal repression on Ataturk's orders, whereupon many were taken from their natural habitat in eastern Turkey and re-located in scattered parts of the new republic. Similarly, Kurdish uprisings in Iran and Iraq after World War I were severely put down by the Shah's forces or those of the Hashemite dynasty in Iraq. A new power came into the picture after World War II, however: the Soviet state. In the northern portion of Iran which the Soviets had occupied during the war, the Soviets helped set up a de facto autonomous Kurdish Republic with its capital in

~~SECRET~~

(635. Continued)

(635. Cont.)

~~SECRET~~

11 March 1963

Mahabad and proceeded to exploit the Kurdish urge for independence, as they were doing simultaneously with the Iranian Azerbaijanis, a Turkic people. But, in accordance with their Tripartite Agreement, the UK and US forces had been withdrawn from Iran; through the UN, the USSR was pressured to do likewise and finally withdrew in May 1946. Iranian forces then marched upon the Kurdish Republic, subdued it and imprisoned or executed many of its leaders. One of those, who managed to elude the Iranian forces and escape into the USSR, was Mollah Mustafa Barzani, chief of the puissant Iraqi tribe of Barzani Kurds. He had fought the Iraqi government intermittently over a long period and had entered Iran with some of his followers to join forces with the newly-created government in that country.

Barzani installed himself and those Kurds who escaped with him among the Kurds of the USSR in Soviet Armenia. Here, now styling himself general, he bided his time for twelve years, at which point the Iraqi revolution of 14 July 1958 erupted. Barzani and his exiled fellow-Kurds were invited back to Iraq by the new Premier, Qasim, and transported by two Soviet vessels to a triumphal welcome in Iraq. Qasim had indicated that he wished to integrate all the Iraqis (Kurd or Arab) into a single nation, but as time passed the Kurds under Barzani became dissatisfied with their treatment. By 1961 the Barzani group were at war from their mountain fastnesses with Qasim's army; this did not include all the Iraqi Kurds, however, for--as is customary among the Kurdish tribes--they were at loggerheads with one another. Nevertheless, the Kurds managed to continue their guerrilla warfare against the Iraqi Army until the end of the Qasim regime on February 8, 1963. Since then there has been an armed truce and negotiations have been going on between the revolutionary successor regime and the Barzani Kurds. It is not known how extensive Barzani's demands have been but it is clear that the new Iraqi Government, with President Arif as its nominal head, is likely to be prepared to offer as many concessions, short perhaps of offering full autonomy and independence for the Kurds, as it feels it can.

Meanwhile, the Soviet bloc--with the USSR well in the foreground--has been waging a furious propaganda campaign to incite both the Iraqi Communists and the Kurds to resist the new government. On 13 February, for example, a clandestine transmitter located in Bulgaria but broadcasting in Persian and Kurdish (and later in Arabic) from studios in Leipzig, East Germany, urged Kurdish listeners to rise against the new regime in Iraq and to join the Communist fighters in the south. The Kurds, the broadcast said, must

11 March 1968

fight for the establishment of a joint Arab-Kurdish regime. The Iraqis were incensed by this outrageous intrusion into their internal affairs, and no doubt not a little irritated by all the name-calling which accompanied it (see attachment). Al Fajr al Jadid in Baghdad on 26 February exposed Communism as a philosophy of violence, anarchy and bloodshedding, "a suppressive system drawing its elements from Marxist philosophy which is without any human attributes...the crimes of the (Iraqi) Communists were inspired by international Communism". All these Bloc polemics have helped neither the Kurdish nor the Communist cause in Iraq one whit, and the round-up of Iraqi Communists, which began after the revolution early in February, continues.

25X1C10b

~~SECRET~~

11 March 1963

636 AF, FE, NE, WH. Brazil's Congress of Solidarity with Cuba

25X1C10b



BACKGROUND:

"The Congress of Solidarity with Cuba can count on the full support and sympathy of the World Peace Movement."

With these words, the Soviet-manipulated World Peace Council (WPC), the key international Communist front organization, in its December Bulletin signaled its plans to mobilize resources to exploit the Congress of Solidarity with Cuba scheduled for Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 28-30 March. This Congress (actually called a "Continental" Congress although invitations have been sent to Asia, Africa and Europe too) is scheduled to be preceded by a national (Brazilian) meeting in support of Cuba, 26-27 March.

Announced objectives of the Congress are: "To defend Cuba against aggression...; to defend the right of the peasants to own the land they till; to defend the right of students and intellectuals not to debase themselves." The agenda proposes to discuss self-determination and non-intervention; solidarity with the people of Cuba; sovereignty and national emancipation; and peace and the policy of world domination of imperialism.

The predecessor of the Congress, the Latin American Conference for National Sovereignty, Economic Emancipation and Peace sponsored by the WPC in Mexico City in March 1961, was attended by more than 280 leftists who "rubber-stamped" WPC-drafted proposals which promoted "peace" by calling for agitation throughout the Hemisphere. The 1961 meeting endorsed the formation of national liberation movements which have become the action arms of Latin America's domestic Communist Parties responsible for terrorism in Venezuela and other countries.

The most prominent initiator of the Congress of Solidarity with Cuba scheduled for Rio is the rabble-rousing president of the Brazilian Peasants League, Francisco JULIAO. His appeal for a conference which was published in Cuba's Communist Party organ, Hoy, on 22 September 1962, touched off serious efforts to stage the Congress to support Cuba. General Luiz GONZAGA Leite, president of Brazil's Society of Friends of Cuba, was designated chairman of the preparatory committee.

JULIAO declared in late 1961, "I am a Communist and I will
Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010005-5 denied

~~SECRET~~

(636. Continued)

press accounts of his statement. He is described as a crypto Communist or pro-Communist. In any event, he has made it clear that he believes in violence and agitation as a means to achieve his objectives and that he is an admirer of Fidel Castro and Mao Tse-tung. His Peasants League has become a strong force for revolutionary agitation among Brazil's rural population. While some Brazilian Communists criticize his advocacy of violence, they have cooperated with him. JULIAO gained a national forum for preaching agitation when he was elected to the Brazilian Congress in October 1962.

General GONZAGA, identified as a leftist military reserve officer, reportedly maintained clandestine contacts with Italian Communist guerrillas while serving with the Brazilian Army in World War II. Some sources maintain that he is a long-time member of the Communist Party.

The Continental Congress of Solidarity with Cuba in which international participation was invited, was formally announced in October 1962. It was originally scheduled for January 1963, but financial problems, opposition of the Brazilian Communist Party (the BCP was critical of JULIAO as organizer and reportedly desired broadening the announced purpose of the meeting in order to enlist wider support and avoid antagonizing Brazilian officials), and other difficulties forced a postponement until 28-30 March. A behind-the-scenes view of the organizing problems was supplied by secret documents found among the papers of a Cuban delegation aboard a Brazilian Varig airliner which crashed near Lima, Peru, on 27 November 1962. A letter written by Cuba's "man in Brazil" to his headquarters detailed some of the problems, asked for guidance on whether to push to hold the meeting in January as scheduled and appealed for more funds to support it. While Brazilian officials minimized the significance of the documents, others cited their revelation of Cuba's involvement in the Congress and support of subversive guerrilla operations in Brazil as sufficient cause for severing relations with Cuba.

These factors plus the general political climate in Brazil may influence the administration of President Joao GOULART to try to discourage the convening of the Congress of Solidarity with Cuba in Rio. There are some reports that he is not pleased with developments. However, even if the Congress were postponed again the national meeting scheduled to precede it may still be held and the attendance of international observers at this session could, in effect, make it an international Congress of Solidarity with Cuba.

Friction among Communists and their sympathizers may also interfere with the Congress. The Soviets take a dim view of Castro's attempts to assert hegemony over Latin America and their dispute with the Chinese Communists has boiled over into

the open. The Varig plane crash documents revealed some shortcomings in the Cuban-financed efforts of the president of the Brazilian Peasants League, JULIAO, to organize the meeting and to organize subversive guerrilla units. He visited Cuba for pre-Congress discussions in late February and early March. Also present in Havana was the BCP president, Luiz Carlos PRESTES, who arrived after a trip to Moscow. One may draw the logical conclusion that the meeting of these two Brazilians in Havana has a direct bearing on the Congress. It is possible that Soviet pressure may be exerted to postpone the meeting. On the other hand, Communist emphasis on the "support-of-Cuba" theme at recent national Communist Party Congresses in Europe and general propaganda makes it likely that some form of international support-for-Cuba meeting will take place although the site and time may be altered.

25X1C10b



25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010005-5

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010005-5

Outline Biography of Marshal Malinovsky

- 1898 - Born in Odessa.
- 1914 - Ran away to join Czarist army, though under-age.
- 1916 - Wounded, decorated with Cross of St. George, became machine gunner, corporal. Sent to western front in small Russian Expeditionary Force.
- 1917 - Fought in Nivelles offensive, allegedly took part in mutinies of Russian forces in France, allegedly sent to prison or to North Africa.
- 1918 - Fought in Russian Legion in France, in battles at Amiens, Chateau-Thierry, Second Marne.
- August 1919 - Returned to Russia via Vladivostok.
- 10 November 1919 - Joined Red Army, became machine gun instructor.
- 1926 - Became member of the Communist Party.
- 1930 - Graduated from Frunze Military Academy.
- 1936 - In Spain during Civil War.
- 1941 - Commanded Cavalry Corps, became an Army commander on Southern Front. Took part in retreat from Galicia, extricating troops.
- June - August 1942 - Commander, Don Group, North Caucasian Front. Conducted operations at Barvenkovo-Lozov and Stavropol.
- September - December 1942 - Commander, 66th Army, Stalingrad Front.
- December 1942 - Spring 1943 - Commander, 2nd Guards Army.
- Summer 1943 - 1944 - Commander, Southwestern Front.
- 1944 - 1945 - Commander, Second Ukrainian Front, taking part in operations against Jassy, Bucharest, Budapest, Vienna, and Prague.
- August 1945 - Became Commander, Trans-Baikal Front, directed attack from Chita to Mukden and Port Arthur.
- 1945 - 1956 - Commander in Chief, Far Eastern Military District, and representative of the Soviet General Staff with Chinese Communist military leaders.
- 1946 - Became member of the Supreme Soviet.
- 1952 - Became candidate member of CPSU Central Committee.
- 1956 - Became Commander in Chief, Soviet Land Forces, replacing Marshal Koniev, who went to command the Warsaw Pact forces.
- October 1957 - Succeeded Zhukov as Minister of Defense.
- May 1960 - Accompanied Khrushchev on trip to Paris and Berlin.

Clandestine broadcast in Kurdish by Peyk-e Iran in East Germany
26 February 1963:

"Dear brothers and sisters of Iraqi Kurdistan: We begin our talk today with a question: How long will this fighting last? Approximately one year and a half has elapsed since the beginning of General Qasim's bloody aggression against Iraqi Kurdistan. Such a catastrophe, which was brought about by Iraqi dictatorship during the past year and a half and which descended upon the Kurdish nation, is unprecedented.

"What was the reason for the establishment of a dictatorship in Iraq? Why did General Qasim dare to attack Kurdistan? And why was he able to bring this catastrophe upon the Kurdish nation? The reason was that the Iraqi democratic forces did not maintain an internal unity. Those on the side of dictatorship took advantage of this situation. First they attacked the Communist Party. After they crushed the Communist Party, they went after the Kurdish Democratic Party. Not content with this, they incited such people as Kholah Zibari and others against the Kurds. With this excuse they used all their guns, planes, and artillery to attack the Kurds.

"Now the heroic Iraqi Kurdish brothers and sisters, after all these catastrophes, have a right to ask: 'How long will the fighting last? How long will the calamity and bloodshed last?' These are legitimate questions. How and by what means can the Iraqi Kurdish nation get logical, correct, and guaranteed results from all these sacrifices?

"The Iraqi Kurdish nation must be given its legitimate national rights within the framework of a democratic Iraq. This is demanded by all the Iraqi people; this is demanded by all Iraqi democratic forces. The Iraqi Kurdish nation must unite with the Arab nation of this land and form a united democratic national front against Abd as-Salam Arif's fascist (bandits?) and against colonialism, in order to reach their sacred goals. Cooperation with and support for the Iraqi democratic forces is the only way to destroy the Baghdad fascist rule and to restore freedom to the Iraqi Kurdish nation."

* * * * *

Moscow Radio, broadcasting a Tass editorial on 21 February 1963:

"One's blood runs cold on learning the dramatic news of the horrible terror now sweeping Baghdad and other Iraqi towns," F. Seyful-Mulyukov writes in TRUD today. "Troops, police, and fascist thugs are organizing mass searches, arrests, beatings, and the murder of hundreds and thousands of absolutely innocent people."

The article notes that the terror is aimed primarily against the working class and the leaders of mass democratic and patriotic organizations. Through this brutal massacre, the reactionaries are striving to deal a stunning blow to the democratic and patriotic movement of the Iraqi people.

The author recalls that Iraqi communists have made great sacrifices in the struggle for the national interests of their people. Despite the bloody terror of the monarchist agents of the colonialists, the communists, with other patriotic and democratic forces of the country, accomplished the glorious anti-imperialist revolution and overthrew the rotten monarchy in July 1958. After 14 July 1958, the author continues, the democratic forces of Iraq, and first of all the communists, continued the selfless struggle to implement the goals of the anti-imperialist revolution. Now, after the overthrow of the regime of Qasim's personal dictatorship, the reactionary forces are trying to cover their attempts to massacre communists and democrats by contending that they were allegedly the backbone of that regime.

"Victimization of communists," the article stresses, is in full contradiction to the proclaimed policy of national unity, freedom, democracy, and social justice. Terrorizing the democratic forces only plays into the hand of the aggressive imperialist circles, which are dreaming of restoring their lost positions in Iraq. Iraq, the author writes in conclusion, "is living through a tragic time. But as history has shown, a policy of arbitrariness against the popular masses, a sanguinary anticommunist terror, will invariably suffer a defeat.

"The freedom-loving people of Iraq will doubtlessly find sufficient strength to administer, through rallied and concerted action, a rebuff to the crazed reactionaries."

* * * * *

Radio Peyk-e Iran (Clandestine) in Arabic to Iraq 1510 GMT 2 March carries the text of a cable addressed by the secretary general of the central united council of Iranian trade unions, Reza Rusta, to Iraqi President Abd as-Salam Arif strongly protesting the "barbaric crimes" being committed by the Iraqi Government "on the pretext of fighting communism" and demanding a halt to such action.

The radio further carries a five-minute appeal issued by a member of the secretariat of the Iraqi women's league calling upon world women to struggle to put an end to "the fascist campaign of annihilation" launched against the women in Iraq and to "topple the bloody dictatorship."

The program concludes with a talk entitled "The Kurdish people are called upon to unite their forces to struggle against the ruling fascist clique," condemning the new regime in Iraq as one which is hostile to the Kurds and calls upon the Iraqi Kurds to unite their ranks to struggle against the "rule of blood and tears" for the sake of establishing their own nationalist democratic rule.

* * * * *

Radio

/Peky-e Kran (E. Germany) in Kurdish 18 February 1963:

"What is the aim of the Kurdish nation's struggle in Iraq? The Iraqi Kurdish people demand their legal national and democratic rights within the framework of a free, democratic, and independent Iraq. They demand to be delivered from the burdens of oppression and discrimination. The heroic Iraqi Communist Party has always defended the demands of the Kurdish people with clarity and lucidity. During the past two years, in which a despotic one-man rule burnt Iraqi Kurdistan with bombs and bullets, the only Iraqi organization which raised its voice in the defense of the Kurdish nation was the Iraqi Communist Party. And now only a (word indistinct) democratic government dependent on the Iraqi people can satisfy the national and democratic demands of the Kurdish people." Arif is the servant of colonialism and the enemy of the peoples. "This (corrupt?) element will suppress the liberating Kurdish revolution the first opportunity he finds.

"Dear Iraqi Kurdish brothers: Do not lose the opportunity in vain. All Iraqi people--the Kurds and the Arabs--have the same fate and the same destiny. It is now incumbent for Kurds and Arabs to (word indistinct) in a united way, to enter the battle, to destroy the fascist government of Abd as-Salam Arif, and to establish a democratic government in their homeland. Do not forget this great historic duty."

Al Jamahir, Baghdad (pro-revolutionary government daily) in Arabic 26 February 1963: "Is the Soviet Attitude Toward Iraq the Outcome of its Failure in Cuba and its Struggle with China?"

"No doubt the attitude of the Soviet Union towards our national revolution could be explained as being the result of

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010005-5
the Astroneph movement which is considered the strongest
Iraqi Communist movement in the Middle East and the tool for a first
coup d'etat in favor of the Soviet Union in this area.

"All the neutral states enjoying full sovereignty and the other states following Western and American policy have, naturally, refused for various reasons to allow the Soviet Union a foothold in this area. From the many documents which Ramadan 14 July 1958 revolutionary government seized, it was revealed that it was expected to establish the first full Communist rule in Iraq to be under the entire domination of the Soviet Union.

"The setback of the Soviet Union was, no doubt, great when it found another large and deep-rooted popular movement upsetting its plans and depriving it of the fruits of victory by establishing the first Communist prop in the Middle East. That is why we are not astonished at the mad campaigns following this setback, for it is said that the rage will be more intense when the ripe fruit which is about to be swallowed is lost.

"The Cuban adventure for both Russia and America has had some effect. We are now concerned with the Soviet Union only.

"Soviet leaders found themselves accused of betraying the Communist principles which call for the defense of any other Communist state subjected to aggression by the American bloc states.

"This accusation made by China has led the Soviet rulers to find various excuses which have made the world laugh, i.e., that the rockets sent to Cuba were not for military purposes. It was merely a theatrical act meant only to frighten America they said.

"After its failure in Cuba, the Soviet Union was in need of a new base so as to restore confidence in its leadership. Unfortunately, we believe this fell on a small peaceful state trying to find its way towards progress. That state is our Iraqi Peoples Republic.

"Thus the Soviet rulers acted. They played the role of cowardice in front of the United States, whereas they came to our meek small nation to play the role of heroism. But, in fact, they lost the love and respect of both peoples, the Cuban and the Iraqi peoples, who have erased the name of the Soviet Union from the list of the states on whose good intentions one could rely."

Congress of Solidarity with Cuba

Communist Appeals for Support

Statements used by Communists in their pre-Congress publicity for the Congress of Solidarity with Cuba, scheduled for the 28th to the 30th of March in Brazil, include the following appeals and misrepresentation:

"A large group of people, well-known in Brazil in the field of politics, science and arts ... took the initiative of convening a Continental Congress."

"The people of Brazil welcome the Congress with enthusiasm and thousands from all walks of life are supporting it."

"Eminent persons from all over the world ... will be participating."

"The Congress is open to all people and organizations -- trade unions, peasants, cultural, humanitarian, political, youth and women's, etc."

"... to show the collective will of all men and women of our continent."

"... men and women throughout the world... whose one aspiration is the preservation of peace."

See also the report of the security committee of the Organization of American States (released on 22 February and reported in many papers) warning against Communist subversion. This report of official opinion in the Western Hemisphere directly refutes attempts of the Congress of Solidarity with Cuba to speak for all the people of the area.